arXiv:1302.2299v1 [math.NT] 10 Feb 2013

ON IMPROVING ROTH'S THEOREM IN THE PRIMES

ERIC NASLUND

Abstract. Let $A \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$ be a set of prime numbers containing no non-trivial arithmetic progressions. Suppose that A has relative density $\alpha = |A|/\pi(N)$, where $\pi(N)$ denotes the number of primes in the set $\{1, \dots, N\}$. By modifying Helfgott and De Roton's work [7], we improve their bound and show that for every $\epsilon > 0$

$$\alpha \ll_\epsilon \frac{N}{(\log\log N)^{1-\epsilon}}.$$

1. Introduction

In 1936, Erdös and Turán [3] conjectured that if a set $A \subset \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3 \dots\}$ contains no k term arithmetic progressions, then it cannot be "too large." We say that $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ has positive (upper) density if for some $\epsilon > 0$

$$\limsup_{x\to\infty} \frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \le x} 1_A(x) \ge \epsilon,$$

and throughout this section we will exclude those trivial arithmetic progressions with difference 0. In 1953, Roth [8] proved that if a set $A \subset \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3 \dots\}$ contains no non-trivial arithmetic progressions, then A has density 0. Quantitatively, he showed that

$$|A \cap \{1, 2, \dots, N\}| \ll \frac{N}{\log\log N}.$$

Roth's Theorem has been improved significantly over the last 60 years by Heath-Brown, Szemerédi, Bourgain, [6, 10, 1, 2] and most recently Sanders [9] who obtained

$$|A \cap \{1, 2, \dots, N\}| \ll \frac{N (\log\log N)^5}{\log N}.$$

Moving to the set of prime numbers, which we will denote $\mathcal{P}$, we define the relative density of a set $A \subset \mathcal{P}$ up to N to be

$$\alpha(N) = \frac{|A \cap \{1, 2, \dots, N\}|}{|\mathcal{P} \cap \{1, 2, \dots N\}|}. \tag{1.1}$$

In 1939, Van Der Corput [11] showed that $\mathcal{P}$ contains infinitely many non-trivial three term arithmetic progressions. 64 years later, in 2003, Green [4] proved an analogue

---

Date: February 9th 2012.

of Roth's Theorem inside the primes, showing that if $A \subset \mathcal{P}$ contains no non-trivial arithmetic progressions, then

$$\alpha(N) \ll \left(\frac{\log\log\log\log\log N}{\log\log\log\log N}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Helfgott and De Roton [7] improved this density bound, removing two log's from the denominator, obtaining

$$\alpha(N) \ll \frac{\log\log\log N}{(\log\log N)^{\frac{1}{3}}}. \tag{1.2}$$

Their result implicitly uses the best quantitative bound on Roth's Theorem in the integers, and when the proof is run through again with Sander's bound, the density recovered is

$$\alpha(N) \ll \frac{(\log\log\log N)^{\frac{5}{2}}}{(\log\log N)^{\frac{1}{2}}}. \tag{1.3}$$

Our main result is the following:

Theorem 1. *Suppose that $A \subset \mathcal{P} \cap [1, N]$ contains no non-trivial arithmetic progressions. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, the relative density α of A inside $\mathcal{P} \cap [1, N]$ is bounded above by*

$$\alpha \ll_\epsilon \frac{1}{(\log\log N)^{1-\epsilon}}.$$

The notation $\ll_\epsilon$ means that the constant is allowed to depend on ϵ.

Our proof parallels that of Helfgott and De Roton, but a factor of two is gained in the exponent by using the L^k norm rather than the L^2 norm of the convolution of the indicator function of the set of primes and the indicator function a set Σ. Using this higher norm introduces several combinatorial difficulties which are dealt with in section 2 and in the proof of proposition 2. This L^k norm bound tells us that we cannot have large outliers in a more precise way, and allows us to choose a larger subset on which the convolution is uniformly bounded from below. As in Helfgott and De Roton, the bound on Roth's Theorem yields a lower bound on the the size of the three term progression operator applied to this uniform set. If the set Σ is chosen correctly, the three term progression operator of the convolution cannot be too far from that of the indicator function of the primes, which gives the desired density bound for the primes.

1.1. Preliminaries and Notation.

Given a function $f : \mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{C}$, where N is a prime, we define the Fourier transform to be

$$\hat{f}(t) = \mathbb{E}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}} f(x) e^{2\pi i x t/N}.$$

The convolution operation is given by

$$(f * g)(x) = \mathbb{E}_{y\in G} f(y) g(x-y), \tag{1.4}$$

which is suitably normalized so that

$$\widehat{f * g}(t) = \hat{f}(t)\hat{g}(t). \tag{1.5}$$

We define the norms

$$\|f\|_{L^k(G)} = \mathbb{E}_{x\in G}|f(x)|^k,$$

and

$$\|\hat{f}\|_{\ell^k(G)} = \sum_{x\in G} |\hat{f}(x)|^k.$$

When there is no ambiguity, we will omit the notation $\ell^k(G)$ and $L^k(G)$, and simply write $\|\cdot\|_k$. We will make use of the fact that the inner product $\langle f, g\rangle_{L^2(G)} = \mathbb{E}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}} f(x)\overline{g(x)}$, satisfies Plancherel's identity

$$\mathbb{E}_{x\in x\in\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}} f(x)\overline{g(x)} = \sum_{t\in\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}} \widehat{f}(t)\overline{\widehat{g}(t)}, \tag{1.6}$$

from which we obtain $\|f\|_{L^2(G)} = \|\hat{f}\|_{\ell^2(G)}$. Given functions $f, g, h : G \to \mathbb{C}$, we let $\Lambda(f, g, h)$ denote the three term arithmetic progression operator defined by

$$\Lambda\left(f, g, h\right) = \mathbb{E}_{x,d\in G} f(x)g(x+d)h(x+2d).$$

2. Sieving the Primes

Let $A \subset [1, N]$ be a subset of the primes with relative density α so that $|A| \sim \alpha\frac{N}{\log N}$, and suppose that $\alpha \geq \frac{\log N}{\sqrt{N}}$. Then in what is known as the "W trick" we may obtain a density increase of $\frac{1}{\log\log N}$ by sieving out the smallest primes. Let $W = \prod_{p\leq z} p$ be the product of the primes less than z, and choose $z = \frac{1}{4}\log N$ so that $W \approx N^{\frac{1}{4}}$ is a small power of N. Splitting into the different arithmetic progressions modulo W, there will be exactly $\phi(W)$ nontrivial residue classes. By the pigeon hole principle there exists an arithmetic progression $AP(b) = \left\{b + nW \ : \ 1 \leq n \leq \frac{N}{M}\right\}$ with

$$|AP(b) \cap A| \gg \alpha\frac{N}{\log N}\frac{1}{\phi(W)} - z \tag{2.1}$$

where the z on the right hand side appears because $AP(b)$ starts with $n = 1$ rather than $n = 0$, and we are not counting the first z primes. Let P be the least prime larger then $\frac{3N}{W}$, so that $P \ll \frac{N}{W}$, and let $A_0 \subset [1, P]$ be the set

$$A_0 = \left\{n = \frac{m-n}{W} \ : \ m \in AP(b) \cap A\right\},$$

noting that an arithmetic progression in A_0 can be lifted to a progression in A. Since

$$\frac{W}{\phi(W)} = \prod_{p\leq z}\left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1} \asymp \log z,$$

and $P \ll \frac{N}{W}$, we see that $\frac{N}{\phi(W)} \gg P\log z$, and so by equation 2.1 we have that

$$|A_0| \gg \alpha\frac{\log z}{\log N}P.$$

Define $a = \frac{\log N}{\log z} 1_{A_0}$ to be the normalized indicator function for the set A_0. This function satisfies

$$\|a\|_1 = \mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_P} a(n) = \alpha,$$

and

$$\|a\|_2^2 = \mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_P} a(n)^2 = \mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_P} a(n) = \frac{\log N}{\log z}\alpha.$$

In section 3 we will examine the key quantity $\Lambda(a,a,a)$ in detail. To do this, we will first need a bound on the L^k norm of the convolution of a, which is discussed in the following section.

2.1. **Bounding the L^k norm of the convolution.**

Our goal is to provide bounds on the L^{2k} norms of $a * \sigma$ where σ is the indicator function of a set Σ.

Proposition 2. *Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer, and suppose that $\sigma = \frac{1_\Sigma}{\mu(\Sigma)}$ is the normalized indicator function of a set $\Sigma \subset \left[-\frac{P}{4}, \frac{P}{4}\right] \subset \mathbb{Z}_P$. Then we have that*

$$\|a * \sigma\|_{2k} \ll_k 1 + \left(\frac{\log N}{\log z}\right)^{1-\frac{1}{2k}} |\Sigma|^{-\frac{1}{2k}}.$$

We will make use of a corollary of Theorem 5.7 from Halberstam and Richert [5]:

Lemma 3. *Let $g \in \mathbb{N}$, and suppose we are given $0 < M \leq 3x$ and distinct $a_1, \dots, a_g$ each co-prime to W with magnitude less than $3x$. Let $\rho(p)$ be the number of solutions to*

$$(Wn + a_1)(Wn + a_2) \cdots (Wn + a_g) \equiv 0 \ mod\ p,$$

and let $\mathcal{A} = |\{n \leq x : \ Wn + a_i \text{ prime for } i = 1, \dots, g\}|$. Then

$$|\mathcal{A}| \ll_g \frac{x}{(\log x)^g} \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{\rho(p) - 1}{p - 1}\right)\left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-g+1},$$

where the constant depends only on g.

With this lemma, we prove proposition 2.

Proof. By the definition of the L^{2k} norm and the convolution, we have that

$$\|a * \sigma\|_{2k}^{2k} = \mathbb{E}_x |\left(a * \sigma\right)(x)|^{2k} = \mathbb{E}_x \left|\mathbb{E}_y \sigma(y) a(x - y)\right|^{2k}.$$

Expanding the sum, the quantity $\|a * \sigma\|_{2k}^{2k}$ is bounded above by

$$\mathbb{E}_{y_1, \dots, y_{2k}} |\sigma(y_1)| \cdots |\sigma(y_{2k})| \mathbb{E}_x a(x - y_1) \cdots a(x - y_{2k}).$$

Since a is supported on $\left[0, \frac{P}{3}\right]$, and σ is supported on $\left[-\frac{P}{4}, \frac{P}{4}\right]$, there can be no wrap around inside $\mathbb{Z}_P$, and we have the upper bound

$$\mathbb{E}_x a(x - y_1) \cdots a(x - y_{2k}) \leq \frac{1}{P}\left(\frac{\log N}{\log z}\right)^{2k} |\mathcal{A}(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{2k})| \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{2k}) = \{n \leq P : \ b + (n - y_1)W, \ \dots, \ b + (n - y_{2k})W \text{ all prime}\}.$$

The size of this set of primes is bounded above by the number of $n \leq P$ such that $b + (n - y_1)W$ is prime, and so

$$|\mathcal{A}(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_{2k})| \ll \frac{\phi(W)}{W} \cdot \frac{PW}{\log(PW)} \ll P\left(\frac{\log z}{\log N}\right). \tag{2.3}$$

However we will need our sieving lemma in the case where each of the y_i is distinct. Let

$$I_l = \left\{(y_1, \ldots, y_{2k}) : \; y_i \leq \frac{P}{2}, \text{ with } l \text{ or less distinct coordinates } y_i\right\},$$

$$J_l = \left\{(y_1, \ldots, y_{2k}) : \; y_i \leq \frac{P}{2}, \text{ with exactly } l \text{ distinct coordinates } y_i\right\},$$

so that we may bound our quantity above by a sum from $r = 1$ to $2k$, and over $(y_1, \ldots, y_{2k}) \in I_r$ or J_r. We split this into two cases. When $r < 2k$, we will bound above by the sum over I_r, and when $r = 2k$, we will use a sum over elements in the set J_{2k}. For $r < 2k$, we are looking at

$$\frac{1}{P^{2k+1}} \sum_{r=1}^{2k-1} \sum_{(y_1,\ldots,y_{2k}) \in I_r} |\sigma(y_1)| \cdots |\sigma(y_{2k})| \sum_x a(x - y_1) \cdots a(x - y_{2k}) \tag{2.4}$$

which by equations 2.2 and 2.3 is

$$\leq \left(\frac{\log N}{\log z}\right)^{2k-1} \frac{1}{P^{2k}} \sum_{r=1}^{2k-1} \sum_{(y_1,\ldots,y_{2k}) \in I_r} |\sigma(y_1)| \cdots |\sigma(y_{2k})|.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{P^{2k}} \sum_{(y_1,\ldots,y_{2k}) \in I_r} |\sigma(y_1)| \cdots |\sigma(y_{2k})| &= \frac{1}{|\Sigma|^{2k-r}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{y_1,\ldots,y_r} \sigma(y_1) \cdots \sigma(y_r)\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\Sigma|^{2k-r}}, \end{aligned}$$

we have that the quantity in equation 2.4 is

$$\ll_k \frac{1}{|\Sigma|} \left(\frac{\log N}{\log z}\right)^{2k-1}.$$

For J_{2k}, we use Lemma 3 to attain the upper bound

$$|\mathcal{A}(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_{2k})| \ll_k \frac{P}{(\log P)^{2k}} \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{\rho(p) - 1}{p - 1}\right)\left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-g+1} \tag{2.5}$$

for any tuple $(y_1, \ldots, y_{2k}) \in J_{2k}$. On the right hand side of equation 2.5, ρ is defined so that $\rho(p) = 0$ if $p \leq z$, $\rho(p) = 2k$ if $p > z$ and $p \nmid (y_i - y_j)$ for all $i \neq j$, and $\rho(p) \geq 1$ if $p > z$ and $p | (y_i - y_j)$ for some $i \neq j$. Since $|y_i - y_j| \leq P$, and any integer $y \leq P$ can have at most $\log_z P$ prime factors greater than z, we see that there are at most $(2k)^2 \frac{\log P}{\log z}$ primes greater than z which could divide some difference $y_i - y_j$. This yields the upper bound

$$\prod_{p}\left(1-\frac{\rho(p)-1}{p-1}\right)\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)^{-g+1} \ll (\log z)^g \prod_{p\geq z}\left(1-\frac{\rho(p)-1}{p-1}\right)\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)^{-g+1}$$

$$\ll (\log z)^g \left(\frac{z}{z-1}\right)^{4k^3\frac{\log P}{\log z}},$$

and as $4k^3\frac{\log P}{\log z} \ll_k z$, combined with the fact that $\left(\frac{x}{x-1}\right)^{Cx} \leq e^C$, the above is bounded by a constant depending on k. It follows that for any $(y_1,\ldots,y_{2k}) \in J_{2k}$,

$$\mathbb{E}_x a(x-y_1)\cdots a(x-y_{2k}) \ll_k 1.$$

Since

$$\sum_{(y_1,\ldots,y_{2k})\in J_{2k}} |\sigma(y_1)|\cdots|\sigma(y_{2k})| \ll \mathbb{E}_{y_1,\ldots,y_{2k}}|\sigma(y_1)|\cdots|\sigma(y_{2k})| = 1,$$

the sum over all the $2k$-tuples in J_{2k} is $\ll 1$. Combining the work done so far, we have proven that

$$\|a*\sigma\|_{2k}^{2k} \ll_k 1 + \frac{1}{|\Sigma|}\left(\frac{\log N}{\log z}\right)^{2k-1}.$$

The stated result then follows from the fact that $(n+m)^{\frac{1}{2k}} \leq n^{\frac{1}{2k}} + m^{\frac{1}{2k}}$ for $n,m,k \geq 1$. $\square$

3. Main Theorem

Let a, N, W, P and z be defined as in section 2. Following [7], let

$$R = \operatorname{Spec}_\delta(a) \cup \{1\} = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}/P\mathbb{Z} :\ |\widehat{a}(x)| \geq \delta\} \cup \{1\},$$

and

$$B = B(R,\epsilon) = \left\{n \in \mathbb{Z}/P\mathbb{Z} :\ \forall x \in R,\ \|\frac{nx}{P}\| \leq \epsilon\right\}.$$

The set B is called a *Bohr set* with radius ϵ and frequency set R. Set $\sigma = \frac{1}{\mu(B)}1_B$ to be be the normalized indicator function of the Bohr set B. By including the element 1 in the set R, it follows that σ will be supported on $\left[-\frac{P}{4},\frac{P}{4}\right]$ inside $\mathbb{Z}_P$ when $\epsilon < \frac{1}{4}$. Let $h = a*\sigma$ be our prime indicator smoothed out by the Bohr set B. Our goal is to show that there is little difference between the three term arithmetic progression operator applied to a and h. Notice that

$$\|\sigma\|_1 = \frac{1}{\mu(B)}\mathbb{E}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}_P}1_B = 1,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\|h\|_1 &= \mathbb{E}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}_P}\mathbb{E}_{y\in\mathbb{Z}_P}\frac{1_B(y)}{\mu(B)}a(x-y)\\ &= \|\sigma\|_1\|a\|_1 = \alpha.\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\Delta = |\Lambda(a,a,a) - \Lambda(h,h,h)|$$

where

$$\Lambda(f,g,h)=\mathbb{E}_{x,d}f\left(x\right)g\left(x+d\right)h\left(x+2d\right)$$

is the three term arithmetic progression operator. In Helfgott and De Roton's paper [7], equation (2.6) on page 7 states that

Lemma 4. *For the above definition of* Δ,ϵ,δ *we have*

$$\Delta\ll\epsilon+\delta.$$

Applying proposition 2 with $\sigma=a$, we find that

$$\|a*a\|_2\ll 1,$$

and so $\|\hat{a}\|_4\ll 1$ since $\|a*a\|_2^2=\|\hat{a}\|_4^4$ by 1.6 and 1.5. This yields the bound $|R|\ll\delta^{-4}$ on the size of the dimension of the Bohr set B since

$$|R|\delta^4\leq\sum_t|\hat{a}(t)|^4\ll 1.$$

A well known pigeon hole argument tells us that $|B\left(R,\epsilon\right)|\geq N\epsilon^{|R|}$, and so

$$\log|B|\geq\log N-|R||\log\epsilon|\geq\log N-\delta^{-4}|\log\epsilon|.$$

We note that an equation nearly identical to the above appears on page 9 of [7]. We chose to deduce it again since the bound on $\|\hat{a}\|_4$ was obtained in a different way, without using Green and Tao's results on the Selberg sieve. From now on, we will assume that ϵ,δ satisfy

$$\delta^{-4}|\log\epsilon|\leq\frac{1}{2}\log N. \tag{3.1}$$

In this case, we have that

$$|B|\gg N^{\frac{1}{2}}\gg_k\left(\frac{\log N}{\log z}\right)^{2k},$$

and so by Proposition 2,

$$\|h\|_{2k}=\|a*\sigma\|_{2k}\ll_k 1. \tag{3.2}$$

Using this bound on the L^k norm of $h=a*\sigma$, we prove that $\Lambda(h,h,h)$ must be large.

Proposition 5. *Given a positive integer* $k\geq 2$*, we have that*

$$\Lambda\left(h,h,h\right)\gg_k\exp\left(-c(k)\alpha^{-q_{2k}}\left(\log\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)^5\right)$$

where $q_{2k}=\left(1-\frac{1}{2k}\right)^{-1}$, *and* $c(k)$ *is a constant dependent on* k.

To prove this proposition, we will make use of the following lemma which allows us to find a large subset where the function h is bounded below uniformly.

Lemma 6. *Let* $q,p>1$ *be such that* $\frac{1}{q}+\frac{1}{p}=1$*, and let* $f:\mathbb{Z}_P\to\mathbb{R}^+$ *be a function with* $\|f\|_1=\alpha$*, and* $\|f\|_p\leq C$ *for some* C*. Then there exists a subset* $L\subset\mathbb{Z}_P$ *such for all* $n\in L$ $f(n)\geq\frac{\alpha}{2}$*, and*

$$\left(\frac{\alpha}{2C}\right)^q\leq\mu(L).$$

Proof. Define $L = \left\{n : \ f(n) \geq \frac{\alpha}{2}\right\}$, so that L is the largest possible set satisfying the second condition. Then, if $1_L(n)$ is the indicator function for L we have that

$$\alpha \leq \mathbb{E}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_P} f(n) \leq \frac{\alpha}{2} + \mathbb{E}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_P} f(n) 1_L(n).$$

Applying Hölder's inequality yields

$$\mathbb{E}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}_P} f(n) 1_L(n) \leq \|1_L(n)\|_q \|f(n)\|_p \leq C \left(\mu(L)\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

by our assumption that $\|f\|_p \leq C$. The lemma then follows from the resulting inequality $\frac{\alpha}{2} \leq C \left(\mu(L)\right)^{1/q}$. ☐

Sanders improvement to Roth's theorem [9] states that if $\Xi \subset [1, N]$ with density ξ, then

$$\Lambda\left(1_\Xi, 1_\Xi, 1_\Xi\right) \gg \exp\left(-c\xi^{-1}\left(\log\frac{1}{\xi}\right)^5\right). \tag{3.3}$$

Using this result along with equation 3.2 and lemma 6, we are ready to finish the proof of proposition 5.

Proof. By equation 3.2, it follows that $\|h\|_{2k} \ll_k 1$. Applying lemma 6 to the function h, we obtain a subset $L \subset \mathbb{Z}_P$ with

$$\mu\left(L\right) \gg_k \alpha^{q_{2k}}$$

and $h(n) \geq \frac{\alpha}{2}$ for all $n \in L$ where $\frac{1}{q_{2k}} = 1 - \frac{1}{2k}$. This implies that

$$\Lambda\left(h, h, h\right) \geq \frac{\alpha^3}{8} \Lambda\left(1_L, 1_L, 1_L\right), \tag{3.4}$$

Applying the bound in equation 3.3 to our set L, we have that

$$\Lambda\left(1_L, 1_L, 1_L\right) \gg \exp\left(-c\alpha^{-q_{2k}}\left(\log\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)^5\right)$$

for some constant c depending on k, since the density of L is $\gg_k \alpha^{q_{2k}}$. By equation 3.4, we have that

$$\Lambda\left(h, h, h\right) \gg \exp\left(-c(k)\alpha^{-q_{2k}}\left(\log\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)^5\right),$$

for a different constant $c(k)$ dependent on k, as desired. ☐

Lemma 4 tells us that

$$|\Lambda(h, h, h) - \Lambda(a, a, a)| \ll \epsilon + \delta,$$

and Proposition 5 implies that $\Lambda(h, h, h)$ must be very large. Recalling equation 3.1, the requirement that ϵ, δ satisfy $\delta^{-4}|\log\epsilon| \leq \frac{1}{2}\log N$, we are ready to put everything together and give a precise lower bound for the size of $\Lambda(a, a, a)$. We now prove Theorem 1.

Proof. Suppose that $A \subset \mathcal{P}$ contains no nontrivial arithmetic progressions. Then A_0 contains only the trivial 3 term arithmetic progressions, and we have that the three term arithmetic progression operator is bounded above by

$$\Lambda\left(a,a,a\right) \ll \frac{1}{P}\left(\frac{\log N}{\log z}\right)^3. \tag{3.5}$$

By equation 3.5, lemma 4 and proposition 5 , we must have

$$\frac{1}{P}\left(\frac{\log N}{\log z}\right)^3 + \epsilon + \delta \gg_k \exp\left(-c\alpha^{-q_{2k}}\left(\log\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)^5\right).$$

In the above, the term $\frac{1}{P}\left(\frac{\log N}{\log z}\right)^3$ will be negligible compared to the right hand side provided that $\alpha > \frac{1}{(\log N)^{\frac{1}{4}}}$. Letting

$$\epsilon = \delta = K\exp\left(-c\alpha^{-q_{2k}}\left(\log\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)^5\right),$$

we will have a contradiction if K is taken small enough. These values of ϵ, δ satisfy the necessary constraint $|\log\epsilon|\,\delta^{-4} \le \frac{1}{2}\log N$ as long as

$$\exp\left(c_2\alpha^{-q_{2k}}\left(\log\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)^5\right) \ll_k \frac{1}{2}\log N$$

for some new constant c_2. The above holds when

$$\alpha \gg_k \frac{(\log\log\log N)^{\frac{5}{q_{2k}}}}{(\log\log N)^{\frac{1}{q_{2k}}}} \gg \frac{(\log\log\log N)^{5\left(1-\frac{1}{2k}\right)}}{(\log\log N)^{1-\frac{1}{2k}}},$$

and by taking k sufficiently large, we obtain the main result for any $\epsilon > 0$. $\square$

Acknowledgments

I am very grateful to Julia Wolf for her support, encouragement, and generous help. I am especially thankful for her kind patience during our conversations on the Selberg sieve. I would also like to thank Greg Martin for his helpful comments.

References

[1] J. Bourgain. On triples in arithmetic progression. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 9(5):968–984, 1999.
[2] Jean Bourgain. Roth's theorem on progressions revisited. *J. Anal. Math.*, 104:155–192, 2008.
[3] Paul Erdös and Paul Turán. On Some Sequences of Integers. *J. London Math. Soc.*, S1-11(4):261.
[4] Ben Green. Roth's theorem in the primes. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 161(3):1609–1636, 2005.
[5] H. Halberstam and H.-E. Richert. *Sieve methods*. Academic Press [A subsidiary of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], London-New York, 1974. London Mathematical Society Monographs, No. 4.
[6] D. R. Heath-Brown. Integer sets containing no arithmetic progressions. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 35(3):385–394, 1987.
[7] Harald Andrés Helfgott and Anne de Roton. Improving Roth's theorem in the primes. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (4):767–783, 2011.

[8] K. F. Roth. On certain sets of integers. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 28:104–109, 1953.
[9] Tom Sanders. On Roth's theorem on progressions. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 174(1):619–636, 2011.
[10] E. Szemerédi. Integer sets containing no arithmetic progressions. *Acta Math. Hungar.*, 56(1-2):155–158, 1990.
[11] J. G. van der Corput. Über Summen von Primzahlen und Primzahlquadraten. *Math. Ann.*, 116(1):1–50, 1939.

The University of British Columbia Department of Mathematics, 1984 mathematics road, Vancouver BC, Canada V6T 1Z2.
E-mail address: `naslund.eric@gmail.com`